IRIS AperTO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

The role of extra-clausal constituents in bilingual speech. The emerging of regular patterns in a bilingual corpus

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1689713 since 2019-02-04T15:50:39Z

Publisher:

John Benjamins

Published version:

DOI:10.75/slcs.178

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

05 May 2023

The role of extra-clausal constituents in bilingual speech. The emerging of regular patterns in a bilingual corpus

Abstract

The present contribution provides an account of the behaviour of extra-clausal constituents in bilingual speech. This topic has been investigated in several studies, but often with a particular focus on specific word classes like discourse markers and connectives. A wider perspective based on the notions of extra-clausal constituents and thetical grammar can, however, contribute to a better understanding of some of the dynamics of bilingual speech. This view is outlined throughout this paper on the basis of data from English-Spanish bilingual conversations recorded in Gibraltar, where a clear-cut division is found between elements belonging to the clause, which normally occur in English, and elements belonging to extra-clausal constituents, which normally occur in Spanish, and never the other way around.

1 Introduction

The present contribution aims at exploiting the existing literature on extra-clausal constituents and discourse grammar to achieve a better understanding of the contact phenomenon mainly known from the works of Auer (1999, 2014) as *language mixing*. It relies on Simon Dik's (1997) account of extra-clausal constituents, and on the recent theoretical proposal developed in Kaltenböck *et al.* (2011), Heine (2013), Heine *et al.* (2013) and Heine *et al.* (2014), known as Discourse Grammar. More specifically, throughout the present section it is argued that an approach based on the distinction between Sentence Grammar (SG) and Thetical Grammar (TG) can provide an important key to the interpretation of specific phenomena occurring in bilingual speech. It will be shown that in the data under examination this distinction underlies the emerging of regular bilingual patterns. Section 2 introduces a case study on English-Spanish bilingual speech in Gibraltar. Particular attention is given to a sociolinguistic description of the contact scenery, which provides an external motivation to the phenomena under exam. Section 3 provides an account of the behaviour of different thetical categories, and is divided into three main parts. In Section 3.1 I account for the emergence of bilingual patterns involving formulaic theticals, which represent the most common case; in Section 3.2 I argue that constructional theticals are involved in exactly the same bilingual patterns; this result is particularly interesting if one considers that switching of heavier and partially compositional entities, as is the case with constructional theticals, is a more complex operation in comparison to single-words and completely unanalysable forms. Finally, in

Section 3.3 I address the question whether spontaneous theticals can also be integrated in this framework, stressing some issues related to the evaluation of patterns containing this type of expression. In Section 4, the main results of this research are summarised and discussed.

1.1 Discourse Grammar and language contact

Many studies so far have illustrated that a distinction between clause-internal and clause-external linguistic phenomena is of great significance in language contact studies (Stolz & Stolz 1996, Matras 1998, 2009, Thomason 2001, Stolz 2007). As far as bilingual speech is concerned, extra-clausal constituents (ECCs for short) are generally considered to be a favourite point for switching from one language into the other, and frequently they are expressed in a different language than the rest of the utterance. Many studies have provided examples of this phenomenon, often using different terms depending on the perspective adopted. To mention only a few, Shana Poplack uses the term *tag switching* for cases where there is a switch between a clause and various types of *tags.* These items, in her account, have much in common with ECCs in that they are defined as "freely moveable constituents which may be inserted almost anywhere in the sentence without fear of violating any grammatical rule" (Poplack 1980: 589). Berk-Seligson (1986) considers switching between a sentence and "exclamations", "idioms", "tags" or

"interjections" (p. 325) as a special case of *intersentential code-switching*. Similarly, Gardner-Chloros (1991) distinguishes different classes of *single word switches*, including "greetings", "interjections", "tags", "phatisms", etc. As far as this chapter is concerned, I will use *clause-perpheral code mixing* (Muysken 2000) as a cover term for any switch occurring at the periphery of the clause, and involving some type of ECC, whereas the term *language mixing*, borrowed from Auer (1999, 2014), will be used in a narrower sense and in relation to the functional value of *code mixing* itself.

The great majority of studies in this field have focussed primarily on the case of discourse markers, while other types of ECCs have remained relatively unnoticed. Moreover, even when other groups of ECCs were taken into account, they were just intuitively grouped together, and only a few authors have made reference to specific properties of this class in order to explain particular aspects of bilingual speech. In particular, the intuition that a wider set of ECCs is involved in the same bilingual patterns has been explored in depth in several publications by Yaron Matras (1997, 1998, 2000, 2009, 2011). Building on his own data, as well as on previous findings, he argues that discourse-regulating elements have a greater cognitive saliency than clause-internal elements, which makes them more readily available to transfer. This leads to the definition of a class of *utterance modifiers*, consisting of discourse markers - undoubtedly the best-known case - focus and modal particles, interjections, phasal adverbs, etc. (see Matras 2009:

137). As will be argued in the following paragraphs, this class can be considered, with some exceptions, a contact-based counterpart of the notion of ECCs, and one of the aims of this contribution is precisely to investigate whether recent findings in studies on ECCs can in some way improve our understanding of the dynamics which regulate the emergence of particular bilingual patterns. Thus, relying on accounts such as Dik's (1997) Functional Grammar and Discourse Grammar itself (see above) may lead to two major achievements. On the one hand, bilingual speech can provide additional evidence for the existence of a conceptual distinction between SG and TG. As in the cases discussed by Matras, the data which will be taken into account clearly display a similar divide: elements belonging in SG are regularly drawn from one of the two languages in contact, whereas the other language provides the elements of TG. On the other hand, discourse-oriented theoretical models can give a better insight into the dynamics of bilingual speech because they allow generalisations, thus enabling the researcher to consider several distinct cases of peripheral code mixing as part of the same tendency. The phenomenon of bilingual discourse markers, for example, can be better understood as soon as it is considered alongside with code mixing involving other types of theticals.

1.2 Mixed codes and bilingual speech

This study will make use of the framework outlined in Auer (1999, 2014), where he argues for the existence of a continuum leading from *code switching* to *language mixing* and from *language mixing* to *fused lects*. In *code switching*, speakers alternate between the two languages at particular points such as quotations, digressions and so on, according to the sequential organisation of the conversation; every switch is locally meaningful and relevant for the specific context where it occurs. However, under particular social conditions where bilingual speech is highly frequent and not socially stigmatised, code switching may lose over time its local pragmatic function and become an unmarked communicative strategy. In that case, bilingual speech is regarded as "globally meaningful" (Auer 1999: 310), in the sense that it is contrasted as a whole to monolingual practices. On the structural side, regular patterns start to emerge at this point, and bilingual speech becomes increasingly more constrained in comparison to previous stages. Code mixing is thus more predictable and almost obligatory at particular points, as is the direction in which it takes place: language A and language B, in other words, tend to provide two different and complementary sets of lexical items, with increasingly fewer cases of overlap, but monolingual sentences are still possible. Finally, when this condition remains stable, fusion between the two systems might take place, leading to the formation of *fused lects*. According to this view, new sociolects and new languages arise out of sedimented bilingual patterns and the most extreme result of this process of

fusion is represented by mixed languages in the sense of Bakker & Matras (2003).

The focus of this chapter is on the intermediate stage of this process, i.e. *language mixing*. Here the process of *fusion* is tendential rather than categorical, but still the choice between the two languages is heavily constrained in one direction (see Section 2.2). At this point it is not yet possible to speak of the rise of a new language, but emerging bilingual patterns involving different categories of theticals can constitute the defining feature of what in the literature has become known as *mixed codes*[1] (see Álvarez-Cáccamo 1998 for a definition of *code* as opposed to *variety*), that is to say bilingual practices which have become stable in a given community, and which convey social meaning. In the following paragraphs several types of ECCs are investigated in order to observe the emergence of regularities in bilingual speech which are specific to this class.

2 Data and Methods

[1] Even though according to Auer (2014) the same process of fusion underlies both the formation of mixed codes from bilingual speech and the development of mixed languages in the narrower sense, the two concepts have to be kept theoretically separate. The present paper deals thus with patterns of code mixing which might define a mixed code, but it is in no way related to mixed languages.

The data on which the analysis is based are part of a bilingual corpus collected in Gibraltar during two fieldwork sessions in 2013 and collected in Goria (2015). The aim of the study was to evaluate the effects of intense language contact between English, the official language, and the local Spanish variety, which has no official status. In this section I provide a short sociolinguistic overview of Gibraltar's linguistic situation, as well as an account of the main issues related to the study of bilingual speech in this setting.

2.1 Gibraltar's linguistic situation

Gibraltar lies on a peninsula on the southern coast of Andalusia, in the region of Cádiz. Since 1713 it has been part of the British Overseas Territories, English is the only official language and is now used both in public and private contexts. In addition to standard English, a local substandard variety called *Gibraltarian English* has recently developed (see Kellerman 1996, 2001; Levey 2008). Most of the population, however, is of Spanish origin and a local Spanish variety has been spoken in Gibraltar up to the present day, with only scarce exposure to the national standard. This variety, for which I use the term *Gibraltarian Spanish*, is structurally similar to the varieties spoken in the neighbouring region of Spain (see Lipski 1986).

On the whole, the linguistic repertoire can be considered a case of *dilalia* (see Berruto 1987 *et passim*), or *diaglossia* (Auer 2005): Standard English constitutes here the only H(igh) variety, and Gibraltarian English and Gibraltarian Spanish are both L(ow) varieties. As predictable from many similar situations, the two L varieties are involved in bilingual speech as a regular practice in Gibraltar. Furthermore, in a majority of cases no pragmatic or conversational value can be attributed to single switches, and bilingual speech has to be regarded as the sociolinguistically "unmarked choice" (see Myers-Scotton 1993). This type of mixing has been referred to in the literature as *code switching mode* (Poplack 1980), *code-switching style* (Gumperz, 1964) or, as we have seen, *mixed code* (Maschler 1994) and corresponds, as shown, to Auer's (1999) notion of *language mixing*.

2.2 The corpus

Two fieldwork sessions were carried out, in order to collect spoken data from speakers of different ages. A total of 54 informants were selected from three different age-brackets, namely over 60 years old (15 people), between 30 and 60 years old (10 people), and under 30 years old (29 people); given the qualitative nature of the present study, the sample has not been balanced as in quantitative studies, but males and females are equally represented in each age class. The informants were requested to perform both monologic and

dialogic tasks. For the monologic part, they were asked to speak about facts related to Gibraltar's recent history, giving also their personal opinion on political issues; some informants also provided personal statements about languages and bilingualism in Gibraltar. In the dialogic parts, the speakers were in some cases asked to perform "artificial" tasks, such as to take part in a fictitious dialogue where they had to cooperate in order to solve a practical problem, but the main part of the corpus consists in almost free conversation between the interviewees, with minimal contributions from the researcher, who limited himself to provide a general topic for the discussion. This resulted in the compilation of a bilingual corpus of nearly 22 hours, which was transcribed and analysed with the specific purpose of observing the emergence of situation-specific features of bilingual speech (Goria forthcoming *a*, *b*). Building on the principles introduced in Auer (1998, 1999, 2014), the aim of this research was to investigate the emergence of regular patterns, in order to qualitatively evaluate which structures were involved in language mixing. Now, even though there is still great variation in language use, related in particular to the ongoing shift from a Spanish-dominant community towards an English-dominant one, regularities can indeed be found across all groups of informants. In particular, the most frequent and characteristic pattern according to the data can be represented as:

$$\text{CLAUSE}_{\text{ENG}}\ \text{ECC}_{\text{SPA}}\ \text{CLAUSE}_{\text{ENG}}$$

Whereas the core clause tends to be expressed in English, several elements belonging to the class of ECCs tend to regularly occur in Spanish, so that a clear-cut distinction can be found in the use of sentence grammar and thetical grammar categories by bilingual speakers. Furthermore, the most significant aspect of the emergence of such pattern seems to be its unidirectionality: even though monolingual stretches of talk, without "ECC-switching", can normally be found, whenever switching occurs at clause peripheries[2] it is heavily constrained by this pattern, to the point that no occurrences can be found of a reverse pattern such as:

$$*[\text{CLAUSE}_{\text{SPA}}\ \text{ECC}_{\text{ENG}}\ \text{CLAUSE}_{\text{SPA}}]$$

In other words, it is not immediately predictable whether a switch will occur at a given point, since at this stage bilingual patterns have not yet become obligatory; but if it does occur, it will comply with the general pattern. In the next section I will present a qualitative analysis of the categories of theticals that occupy the ECC slot of this pattern.

3 Bilingual patterns involving ECCS: a qualitative perspective

[2] I do not take into account here the phenomenon of intra-clausal code switching.

As mentioned, different types of theticals can fit in the pattern described above. It will therefore be interesting to analyse the data from Gibraltar in more detail according to the principles of Discourse Grammar. Of particular importance in this respect is the distinction made in Kaltenböck *et al.* (2011) between *formulaic theticals*, *constructional theticals* and *spontaneous theticals*: my main objective is to demonstrate that, even though most of the research on ECCs in bilingual speech has focussed on single word elements belonging to the first type, also more complex items belonging to the other two categories seem to pattern in the same way. Furthermore, integration into the clause will be regarded as a secondary parameter for data categorisation: a distinction will be made between (*a*) elements which are totally autonomous, and which can constitute the unique members of a conversational turn, such as formulae of social exchange, interjections and vocatives, (*b*) elements related to a core-clause, and which cannot occur in isolation, such as discourse markers, sentential adverbs and conjunctions, (*c*) elements which are inside the clause, but which occupy a peripheral position and are not part of its propositional content, such as markers of illocutionary force.

3.1 Formulaic theticals

In TG, formulaic theticals are described as non-compositional and morphologically unanalysable units, which "express functions that are mostly procedural, and [...] relate to the situation of discourse rather than to sentence syntax" (see Kaltenböck *et al.* 2011: 875 *et passim*). I use this notion in order to account for different types of single-word switches, which can be further categorised according to the different type of relation with respect to the core clause. In particular, I make a distinction between *(a)* free-standing units such as interjections and formulae of social exchange; *(b)* discourse markers; *(c)* conjunctions; *(d)* markers of illocutionary force.

3.1.1 Free-standing units

The notion of free-standing ECCs has been proposed, to my knowledge, in Dik (1997) in order to describe entities that are not anchored to a core clause, and that are thus contrasted to ECCs that precede, follow or interrupt the clause. I also consider an additional property of this class of items the presence of illocutionary force: while anchored elements such as discourse markers do not carry an autonomous illocution, free-standing ECCs do have illocutionary force, and, as a corollary, they can be the unique member of a turn unit.[3] Therefore, in terms of integration into the clause, following Muysken (2008),

[3] Illocution alone however cannot be regarded as a reliable criterion, since other items, such as for example left dislocation, in some accounts, like Functional Discourse Grammar (see Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), can have an autonomous illocution.

there is a qualitative distinction between free-standing ECCs, such as for example interjections, and items that are loosely linked to a clause.

As far as the data are concerned, there seems to be a general tendency to prefer Spanish ECCs to English ones, as illustrated in the following examples:[4]

(1) PB: have you been up the rock ## to see *lo'*galleries

'Have you been up the Rock? To see *the* galleries?'

EG: i've been two years ago to see the touristic part but in fact – maybe tomorrow there's a friend who's coming to visit me and -

PB: ***vale vale*** # you'll do it

'*Right, right*. You'll do it'

(2) EG: maybe some gibraltarians go abroad for university

AG: ***si*** i'm planning of going to uni

'*Yes*, I'm planning of going to uni'

However, the status of these items in bilingual speech is far less clear than with other types of theticals, and there seems to be a great deal of variation in use, in particular with formulae of social exchange. Examples (3) and (4) thus display an opposite behaviour with respect to the previous examples:

(3) **hi** ## *pued-o* *habl-á* *con* albert **please** ## **thank_you**

can.PRES-1sg speak-INF with

"hi, can I speak with Albert please? Thank you."

[4] Where an explicit reference to other published works is not provided, the examples are all from Goria (2015). As in the original transcription, I use a <#> sign to indicate a short pause inside the prosodic unit, and a <##> sign to indicate the boundaries of a prosodic unit. All Spanish words are quoted in italics, both in the examples and in the correspondent translation, whereas boldface is used in order to stress the phenomenon under examination.

(4) **excuse me** ## **sorry excuse me** ## **sorry** ##

cuando pued-a no'=pon-e' otro café

when can.PRES-SUBJ.2sg 1PL.OBL=put-PRES.2SG other coffee

grande # un café con leche # y

large a coffee with milk and

un té **please** ## **thank_you**

a tea

"excuse me, sorry, excuse me. sorry, *when you are able to, could you bring us one more large coffee, coffee with milk, and a tea please*, thank you"

This lack of uniformity in the data, which is inconsistent with the striking regularities involving other classes of ECCs, could be explained by the fact that even though this type of switching has surface similarities with clause-peripheral code mixing, it is not completely identical to it. Formulae of social exchange are in fact in this respect more similar to one-word utterances than to particles, and their behaviour in bilingual speech is perhaps more related to the dynamics of inter-sentential code switching: language selection in this case seems to respond to local and contingent pragmatic needs, and is possibly related to social prestige. However, given the monologic and argumentative nature of many interviews, free-standing ECCs, and formulae in particular, are quantitatively too scarce to identify particular trends. For this reason, I will not address this type of switching in detail.

3.1.2 Discourse Markers

Discourse markers are probably the best-known case of clause-peripheral code mixing, and lots of examples have been provided from several languages. To quote but a few of these works, bilingual discourse markers are central in Brody (1987), Salmons (1990), Holzinger (1993), de Rooij (2000), Maschler (1994, 1998, 2000) and Matras (1998, 2000). Most of these studies reveal a strong tendency for this category to be switched and/or borrowed in cases of language contact, as part of a more general tendency to separate processes of *languaging* from processes of *metalanguaging* (Maschler 1994 *et passim*). Furthermore, the most extreme result of language contact is represented by the complete fusion of the system of discourse markers of one language with that of the contact language (see Auer 2014 for examples).

As expected, Spanish DMs considerably outnumber their English counterparts in the dataset, and the English forms are restricted to few highly frequent items such as *you_know*. Furthermore, while Spanish DMs can appear at the periphery of both an English and a Spanish clause, English DMs are found exclusively in monolingual speech, complying thus with the general pattern mentioned above. Some examples are provided below:

(5) we cannot say ## ***bueno*** # we pay you that ## he has to go to the department of education # sit down # have a meeting with the director or whatever

‘we cannot say: *well*, we pay you that…’

(6) KR: yeah it's good (4.2)

EG: and with a character who is also known to the community

KR: very well-know very loved ## *y* ***te digo*** i_mean he knows it # he knows his stuff

'very well-known, very loved, *and I tell you*, I mean, he knows it. He knows his stuff'

(7) *rosto* ***dice*** mum ***dice*** *e'to é:* # italian ## because we know it as *rosto pero* it's just another ***dice*** typical food # I don't know # from some # region in Italy

'*rosto, he says:* "mum", *he says:* "*this is* Italian. Because we know it as *rosto but* it's just another - *he says* – typical food from – I don't know – some region in Italy".'

(8) i usually feature (in) a list # media list or whatever ## ah KR (he) is a contact in gibraltar ## ***mira*** i need to find # a xxx place # to stay at an hotel or rent an accommodation

'I usually feature in a list, a media list or whatever. Ah KR, he's a contact in Gibraltar. *Look,* I need to find, a xx place to stay at an hotel, or rent accommodation'

These examples show that code mixing between clause and ECCs is particularly well attested in the case of DMs, and it displays all the features of Auer's stage of *language mixing*; in particular, it is regular and systematically unidirectional. A further step towards fusion would be then represented by the possibility of applying the same pattern in all contexts and with all DMs, but due to the absence of quantitative data it is not possible to test whether such a development has taken place. However, along with these synchronic tendencies, DMs are a good case study because they also show the effects of structural contact-induced change. This will be illustrated through a more detailed account of the behaviour of the Spanish DM *no*.

Previous studies on *no* in Gibraltarian bilingual conversations have been carried out by Moyer (2000), resulting in the identification of two main interactional functions, namely that of indicating a true "yes-no request", and

that of inviting confirmation through "information checking", as in examples (9) and (10):

(9) yeah but rapidly you settled down and you're coping okay ***no*** # with everything

(10) *había* *tráfico* *de electrónica* *de* *gibertá* *pa'* *fuera*

have.PST.IPFV.3SG smuggling of electronic goods from Gibraltar towards outside

in those days ## xxx ## *ya* *no* # *ya* it's changed ##

now no now

now it's pretty better to get it over there ***no***

"*there was smuggling of electronic goods from Gibraltar outwards*, in those days. *Now* no, *now* it's changed. Now it's pretty better to get it over there, *isn't it*?"

Both functions of *no* can easily be accounted for also in monolingual Spanish, as can be seen from works such as Martín Zorraquino & Portolés (1999). More precisely, it can be considered a pragmatic marker whose function is chiefly to invite a confirmatory move from the addressee, and its function can therefore be subsumed under the general heading of *interaction management* (Dik 1997). Now, these interactional functions appear to coincide completely with the ones which are commonly regarded as prototypical in English question tags such as *isn't it*, *don't you*, *aren't you* etc. These forms, however, also display typically monologic uses and emphatic functions (see Algeo 1998, 2006) which do not seem attested in Spanish; see example (11), where *no* is clearly not used in order to elicit some response from the addressee, but in order to emphasise the content of the preceding utterance:

(11) I don't want wet and mud all over my shop, **do I** now? [Algeo 2006]

Kimps *et al.* (2014) have recently demonstrated that also in British English monologic functions of question tags, exemplified in (11), are attested more frequently than the function of interaction management.

Looking more closely at the data from Gibraltar, *no* appears to be a highly frequent element, both in monolingual and in bilingual speech. English question tags, on the other hand, are completely unattested. It could therefore be assumed that the Spanish structure has begun to replace its English counterparts due to the functional parallelism of the two forms in interactional use. At a later stage, the use of *no* in English sentences must have then extended also to monologic contexts where it has an emphatic function; see for example (12)-(14).

(12) Unfortunately with the tv and the news and everything it's happening here now # i can see it ***no***

(13) *a vece' me sale la - el nombre en inglé*

sometimes 1SG.OBL come out the.F the.M name in English

a vece' en e'pañó a vece' en llanito ##

sometimes in Spanish sometimes in llanito

and it just # goes # i don't even think twice about it ***no***

"sometimes the name comes out from me in English, sometimes in Spanish, sometimes in Llanito"

(14) And i think it's a shame to lose the heritage and culture of how we came ***no***

It is clear from the context of these examples that *no* is not used in order to elicit a confirmative move from the addressee, nor do they act as hedging

devices. Rather, it seems to function as an emphatic device, especially in sentences where the speakers express personal evaluations which do not need the addressee's agreement. This function seems directly related to the use of punctuational tags in British English, as in (11), which are characterised by "use in a soliloquy", and where "no response or interaction with an addressee apart from the speaker is possible" (Algeo 2006: 299). This leads us to hypothesise that although monologic uses of *no* may also be present in non-contact varieties of Spanish, in the case of Gibraltar the diffusion of this feature is highly influenced by the presence of a similar structure in English.

To conclude, the case of *no* seems to be particularly representative of the behaviour of DMs in the data. In Goria (2015) quantitative and qualitative data are provided for several DMs, showing that in all cases switching is possible in only one direction, and there are no instances of Spanish clauses with English DMs. The general trend would thus be that Spanish DMs are gradually replacing their English counterparts, but whereas most of the Spanish DMs are still only statistically prevailing, *no* has already fully replaced the English question tags.[5] Therefore, since the case of *no* does not admit exceptions it should be regarded as a fully established feature of Gibraltarian English.

[5] It has also to be observed that the substitution of a constructional, and thus syntactically complex element such as a question tag with an uninflected form also has the advantage of reducing the syntactic weight of the construction. This is precisely what can be observed in several contact varieties of English, where question tags are systematically replaced either by invariant English forms, or with indigenous lexical material (see Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008 for examples).

3.1.3 Coordinating conjunctions

Conjunctions are included in the present account even though they have not previously been regarded as theticals, nor do they appear in the description of ECCs by Dik (1997). The reason for this choice is that conjunctions actually share at least some of the properties of theticals, and in many cases of code mixing they tend to pattern in the same way as DMs (see Muysken 2000); for this reason, they have been considered as part of the class of utterance modifiers in Matras (1997, 1998). Furthermore, it is not always possible to make a clear-cut distinction between conjunctions and discourse markers, particularly in the case of those conjunctions which perform textual functions (see Pons Bordería 2006). Conjunctions are considered here as functional elements which express a number of functions on the discourse level, and which are particularly related to text organization. They seem, however, to have a more grammatical than pragmatic status, due to some more specific properties, such as different conditions for omissability and less positional freedom. In order to make this distinction more clear-cut, I have only taken into account what could be regarded as "prototypical conjunctions", i.e. the forms corresponding to the three basic types of coordination relation (Mauri 2009): *and, but, or*. The results will therefore be comparable to the ones quoted in Matras (1997, 1998), who argues for the existence of an implicational hierarchy in the transfer of conjunctions, so that if a language

borrows “and” conjunctions, it will also have borrowed “or” conjunctions, and if it has borrowed “or” conjunctions it is likely to also have borrowed a “but” conjunction; this can be represented in the form of the following implicational hierarchy:

but > or > and

In the Gibraltar corpus, switching of coordinating conjunctions complies without exception to the pattern discussed above: conjunctions occur in Spanish and the core clause in English, whereas no examples were found of two Spanish clauses linked by an English conjunction. See examples in (15)-(17).

(15) as i said i think the # the younger generation's losing the llanito ## because of the schooling ## and knowing that ## ***pero*** they go for exams ## they have to do their work

‘…*but* they go for exams…’

(16) that in itself is a debate ## ***pero*** *que_va* # we miss ## *y* those are the debates we should be having

‘… *but not at all!* We miss. And those are the debates we should be having’

(17) in their family *a mejó* happened a hundred years earlier ## ***pero*** they kept it alive ## ***y*** the last - i think it was a lady ## and she died in the nineties

‘in their family *probably it* happened a hundred years earlier. *But* they kept it alive…’

The data, however, reveal a partial inconsistency with Matras’s implicational hierarchy: all the instances of switched conjunctions involved the conjunctions *pero* “but” and *y* “and”, but there were no instances of a switched “or” conjunction, whereas according to the hierarchy when “and” is switched one would expect all the three conjunctions to be switchable.

However, it must be stressed that Matras specifically deals with cases of borrowing, and probably in the case of bilingual speech the implicational hierarchy should be applied in a less categorical way: if one allows a probabilistic reading, the result would be that in bilingual speech *but* conjunctions are more frequently switched than *or* conjunctions, and switched *or* conjunctions outnumber switched *and* conjunctions. In fact, according to quantitative evaluations provided in Goria (2015), *pero* appears to be the most frequently switched conjunction, followed by *y*, and this is partly expected from the hierarchy, at least in the "weaker" reading. In this view, even the absence of switched *or* conjunctions can be seen in terms of frequency: *or* conjunctions are considerably fewer in the corpus and this could be one of the reasons why there are no instances of bilingual patterns involving this conjunction.

3.1.4 Modality and illocution

Among the different types of ECCS considered in the present account, the highest level of integration into the clause is represented by two related sets of items that pertain to the domains of modality and illocution. As discussed in Bybee & Fleischman (1995),[6] modality concerns the lexical (i.e. non-grammaticalised) expression of the speakers' attitude towards the

[6]Mood, on the other hand, is regarded as a verbal category which corresponds to the grammatical expression of the attitudes of the speaker.

propositional content of an utterance. This function thus corresponds to the *attitudes of the speaker* dimension in Kaltenböck *et al.* (2011), and is normally associated to modal particles (MPs). This set of expressions has been the object of several studies and has to be kept distinct from DMs for two main reasons: (i) DMs are discourse-oriented whereas MPs are speaker-oriented; (ii) MPs have fixed scope over the propositional content of the utterance whereas DMs have variable scope and generally are relevant on a wider scale (see Traugott 2007 for a wider discussion of this distinction). Furthermore, as Aijmer (2002) points out, this type of particle may also have the function of stressing or hedging the illocutionary force of a speech act, and in this sense they are also related to what in Functional Grammar are called "illocutionary operators" (see Hengeveld 1989, Dik 1997). For this reason, this paper has also taken into account illocutionary particles (IPs) along with full-fledged MPs: given the nature of the two languages in contact, the lexical expression of illocution is normally considered as a case of stressing what in normal conditions is conveyed by more "canonic" devices such as prosody, mood and so on.

An interesting case of bilingual patterns in this domain involves some highly idiosyncratic occurrences of the Spanish complementiser *qué* in interrogative matrix clauses, where its function is that of an MP. In Spanish *que* normally has the function of a general subordinator but it may also occur in insubordinated sentences with a reportative function, as pointed out for

example by Escandell Vidal (1999) and Demonte & Fernández Soriano (2014). Another function of *qué* in matrix clauses is what Butler (2003) calls 'reinforcing *qué*': the particle can be used to emphasise the illocutionary force of different types of speech acts, especially miratives and imperatives (see also Hengeveld 1989; Garrido 1998). Sentence (18) will thus have an emphatic value since *que* marks here exclamative illocution, as opposed to the declarative reading of (19) (both examples from Garrido 1998[7]):

(18) ¡**Que** vien-e Juan!
MP come-PRES.3SG Juan
"Juan is coming!"

(19) Viene Juan
come-PRES.3SG Juan
"Juan is coming"

As for the Gibraltar corpus, the analysis is limited to the use of *qué* in interrogative matrix clauses, where it clearly has an emphatic value.

(20) he calls his friend *dice* ## ***qué*** how are things
'he calls his friend *says:* "how are things?"'

(21) ***qué*** what's this thing
'what's this thing?'

In (20), a reportative reading of *qué* is unlikely because reported speech is only marked by the use of *dice*, and *qué* does not function as a complementiser

[7] In contrast with Garrido (1998), the source of our examples, I prefer to gloss *que* in insubordinated sentences with MP (i.e. 'modal particle'), in order to stress the difference with that-complementisers.

in the reported clause; similarly, in (21) no reportative value is retrievable. It can be seen that in these sentences *qué* patterns exactly as other types of theticals analysed in the previous sections, in that it appears as the only switched element of an English clause. Furthermore, it can also be observed that, in the case of open questions, the English sentence still has a *wh-* element which contributes to marking interrogative illocution; however, in yes/no questions such as (22) and (23) *qué* is the only device that overtly marks illocution, possibly alongside with rising intonation; in any case, no instances of VS inversion were found in English yes-no questions introduced by *qué.*

(22) ***qué*** you're funding your own research

‘are you funding your own research?’

(23) ***qué*** you liked the story

‘did you like the story?’

What can be concluded about these instances of bilingual patterns is that even though MPs seem more clause-internal than DMs, since they do not have scope over the entire utterance, they clearly pattern in the same way as the other theticals. This means that in this type of bilingual speech the separation between clauses and ECCs could be perhaps seen more specifically as a separation between illocutionary force and proposition. A similar case, which will only be touched upon in this article, would be that of explicit performatives like *te digo* (“I tell you”) in (24), which likewise has the function of reinforcing the assertive illocution of the utterance.

(24) very well-known very loved ## ***y te digo*** i_mean he knows it # he knows his stuff

'very well-know, very loved. *And I tell you*, I mean, he knows it. He knows his stuff'

Now, it can be argued that cases of bilingual patterns involving items like *digo* in (24) and *qué* in (20)-(23) are similar in principle, in that they involve a type of more or less grammaticalised function words which have scope on the illocution, in contrast with DMs[8]. Finding occurrences of bilingual patterns involving MPs and IPs is thus of particular interest because it shows that even those theticals which are more closely related to the clause are affected by the same dynamics affecting less integrated items like DMs and conjunctions, and they display the same regularities for when it comes to the property of unidirectionality (see 2.2).

3.1.5 Summary

The examples provided so far clearly show that several categories of formulaic theticals are involved in the formation of regular bilingual patterns where the separation between TG and SG is mirrored in the systematic use of two different languages. There are also important qualitative differences in the data between different types of theticals: whereas totally unintegrated items, and in particular formulae of social exchange, behave more freely with

[8] It can't be excluded however that such forms and particularly the ones containing personal references, such as *te digo* may at the same time express interpersonal functions.

regard to language selection, the switching of items that are anchored to an anchor clause is strikingly regular: in all bilingual clauses the elements belonging to theticals grammar were expressed in Spanish, while the clause was in English. At the same time, differences can also be found: even in absence of quantitative evaluations, switching of DMs and conjunctions seems much more common than switching of MPs and IPs, which is only limited to a few types. Quantitative research on the same data will probably confirm the hypothesis that the parameter of integration into the clause may be a factor that co-determines the likelihood of different elements to be included in a bilingual pattern.

3.2 Constructional theticals

A step further in the application of a thetical grammar model would be to take into account also different types of theticals which do not constitute formulaic expressions. In the following sections, I provide some examples of bilingual patterns involving constructional and spontaneous theticals, which display the same regularities that apply to more simple items. Relying on Kaltenböck *et al.*'s (2011) definition of constructional theticals as "recurrent patterns or constructions of theticals, being compositional but having some schematic structure and function", it should be possible to demonstrate that other items than just the single word switches shown above are able to fit in the ECC slot

of the bilingual pattern introduced in 2.1. More precisely, the "constructional" nature of constructional theticals can be seen in two different ways: on the one hand (i) lexical expressions that are syntagmatically more complex than just one-word switches have to be regarded as equivalent in function to formulaic theticals; on the other hand, (ii) more abstract and lexically unfilled constructions have also to be regarded as a good example of constructional theticals.

I consider here, as an example of (i), the case of general extenders (Overstreet 1999, Ariel & Mauri 2014), which are generally subsumed under the class of DMs, even though their structure is more complex. In example (25), the Spanish form *y eso* ("and this") is used as a general extender, i.e. it has the function of composing a non-exhaustive list, where all the other elements except for *at my granny's* remain unspecified; similar to more well-known English expressions such as *and things like that*, *or anything*, etc. the pragmatic use of such forms has to be related with functions such as vagueness, courtesy and with negotiation of shared knowledge. The structure of DMs like *y eso* is however typical of constructional theticals, since it is partially compositional in meaning, and it allows paradigmatic alternatives such as *o eso, y esa' cosa', y to'eso* etc.

(25) i go there sometimes to my granny's ***y_eso*** and i have to come in the morning

'I go there sometimes to my granny's *and stuff*, and I have to come in the morning'

I consider then as an example of (ii) the case of constructions such as left dislocations, hanging topics and pseudo-cleft constructions, which serve the function of signalling informational features of the utterance, and which have already been included as part of thetical grammar. An example of bilingual left dislocation is given in (26).

(26) ***El*** ***perro,*** are you gonna stay with it or what
the dog
'*The dog*, are you gonna stay with it or what'

From the perspective of bilingual speech, the notion of constructional theticals allows to consider more complex types of switch along with formulaic theticals; the main claim would thus be that not only single-word elements are involved in the formation of recurrent bilingual patterns. The behaviour of items from both set (i) and set (ii) seems to confirm this view.

3.2.1 Left dislocation

Left dislocations (LDs) have been the main focus of a great number of studies, both from a formal-syntactic perspective, as constructions with marked word order, and from a functional perspective, as constructions expressing particular informative or pragmatic values. In this account I will adopt only the second of these approaches, and in particular I rely on Lambrecht's (2001a) typologically oriented definition where four basic properties are indicated: (i) the presence of a clause and an extra-clausal constituent (which

would then exclude marked word orders not involving an extra-clausal position); (ii) the semantic equivalence, in terms of truth-value, of a sentence with and without dislocation; (iii) the presence of a pronominal index which is coreferential with the left-dislocated constituent; (iv) the presence of an autonomous prosodic contour. An example is given in (27).

(27) **(As for) Peter**, he is no longer is my friend [Kaltenböck *et al.* 2011]

On formal, and mostly syntactic, grounds a finer grained distinction could then be proposed. As for (iii), in Lambrecht's account any type of coreference between the left-dislocated phrase and the core clause can satisfy this condition; however, there are language-specific constraints according to which every language seems to allow only a particular type of dislocation. As shown for Italian in Cinque (1990), in most of the Romance languages two subtypes can be found, namely a full-fledged left dislocation, which is characterised by case/adposition marking on the dislocated NP and a weak pronoun or clitic in the core clause, and a partially different construction called *hanging topic*,[9] in which the dislocated NP does not display case marking, and the coreferential pronoun can either occur in a strong form (as in Italian) or simply be omitted through a gap strategy (as in Spanish); examples are given respectively in (28) and (29) from Rivero (1980: 363, 366):

[9] I prefer here to use the term *hanging topic*, although the construction is formally equivalent to what, in particular in generative works has been called *topicalization*.

(28) **Al** **partido** **carlista** dic-en que

OBJ party carlist say-PRES.3PL that

no lo legaliz-aron para las elecciones

NEG 3SG.M.OBJ legalise-3PL.PAST for the elections

"the Carlist party, they say that they did not legalize it for the elections"

(29) **Dinero**, dic-en que no tien-e

money say-3PL.PRES that NEG have-3SG.PRES

'money, they say he/she does not have'

Within the functional paradigm, one typically finds information structure oriented accounts of LDs, such as Chafe (1976), Duranti & Ochs (1979), Prince (1981, 1984) and Lambrecht (1994). All of these studies seem to point in the direction that left dislocation is related to the function of introducing a referent which is low in accessibility[10], and at the same time marking it as a Topic[11] in the following proposition. According to Lambrecht's (1994) *principle of separation of reference and role* (see also Kuzar & Netz 2010), it is dispreferred across languages to introduce a new referent in a proposition, and to treat it as a Topic: resorting to a marked construction such as left dislocation would then enable the listener to retrieve a discourse referent and

[10] For reasons of space, it is not possible to discuss in depth the notion of accessibility, for which I refer to Lambrecht (1994). What is crucial for the present discussion is the three-way distinction between *active referents*, which are Topics in a given proposition; *semi-active referents*, which can be retrieved from the situational context, from the textual context, or from the speakers' encyclopedic knowledge of the world (es. *Houses have doors*, *kitchen have sinks…* see Prince 1981), and *brand new referents*, which have the lowest degree of accessibility and need to be explicitly introduced into the discourse.

[11] As a convention, I use 'Topic' with a capital initial to refer to a pragmatic relation between a referent and a proposition, which is strictly confined to sentence grammar (Lambrecht 1994); in all other cases, 'topic' with lower-case is used for discourse topics in a wider sense.

make it available for treatment as a Topic in the following proposition. Prince (1984, 1988), whose discussion is further developed in Ariel (2010: 125) argues for three basic discursive functions of left dislocation: (i) to introduce a new referent; (ii) to retrieve a previously evoked entity, which has a semi-active state; (iii) to "amnesty island constraints violations" for topicalisations; in other words, a dislocation can also be used for contrastive topicalisation in a syntactic context where a resumptive pronoun is required. Furthermore, Duranti & Ochs (1979), who also argue for a discourse-functional interpretation of LDs, also take into account a pragmatic-interactional function. They argue that since changing the Topic is a pragmatically costly action, where a change of speaker is likely to occur, left dislocations appear to be a strategy through which the speakers can keep the floor at particularly "difficult" discourse sites, such as topic shift.

As concerns the study of left dislocation in bilingual speech, several examples of this phenomenon are found in Treffers-Daller's (1994) French-Dutch corpus. The author explains the high frequency of switching of dislocated NPs with reference to a principle of *peripherality*: the more peripheral a linguistic expression is, the greater will be its likelihood of occurring in bilingual sentences. Through left dislocation speakers are thus enabled to avoid switching in clause-internal positions, and in particular switching of subjects. Furthermore, following the constraints presented in Poplack (1980), left dislocation, despite the differences in function across languages, could be

seen as what she calls an *equivalence point,* where switches can occur without violating the syntactic rules of the two languages.

This account of bilingual LDs shows that since left dislocands are part of thetical grammar they show, as expected, the same regularities that characterise other types of theticals. Thus, we can see from the examples below that in bilingual sentences the left dislocated constituent regularly occurs in Spanish, while the core clause is in English; furthermore, no occurrences were found of reverse patterns with an English left-dislocated NP and a Spanish clause:

(30) *Entonce mira 'cucha ##* [***el perro***]$_i$ ## are you gonna stay with [it]$_i$ or what

DM DM DM the dog

'*so, look, listen*: *the dog*, are you gonna stay with it or what?'

(31) you will always find the quickest way ## ***el andalú*** ## perfect example of that *no*

'you will always find the quickest way. *Andalusian:* perfect example of that, *no*?'

(32) this is something which we have learnt to live with ##

y hoy xxx [***la gran mayoría de persona'***]$_1$ *pué mira ##*

and nowadays the great majority of people
DM DM

[they]$_i$ shrug their shoulders

'this is something which we have learnt to live with. And nowadays, *the majority of the people*, *well look*: they shrug their shoulders'

(33) EG: because he has the main requisite ## he knows many languages <…>

PB: yeah ## and the thing is that - ## obviously i _think [***eso***]$_i$ you are born with [it]$_i$

‘Yes, an the thing is that, obviously I think *this thing*, you are born with it’

(34) *Te* *digo* it's interesting ## [***yo***]$_i$ [I]$_i$'m very passionate about it

2sg.OBL tell.PRES.1SG 1SG.SUBJ

‘*I tell you*, it’s interesting: *me*, I’m very passionate about it’

Moreover, a finer-grained analysis can highlight two different information values of the constructions exemplified above: dislocated constituents can be classified according to factors such as their accessibility and activation state, following Lambrecht (1994), with apparent differences in the functional value of the construction. In examples (30) and (31), for instance, left dislocation has the function of introducing a new semi-active referent: in (30) *el perro* was previously introduced by the interviewer, and in (31), even though *el andalú* has not been introduced, it seems to be retrievable by both speakers from the main topic of the conversation. In the other sentences, however, the situation is different: (32) contains a highly non-specific reference “the majority of the people”, (33) contains an anaphoric pronoun, and (34) a deictic personal pronoun. All these types of entities can be said to be inherently active, since their reference is immediately retrievable, and they represent prototypical Topics, as far as activation state is concerned. I will refer in the rest of this paper to the first construction as “nominal left dislocation” and to the second as “pronominal left dislocation”. The first construction is regarded here as more clearly related to informative functions, while the latter seems to express rather a pragmatic function, as argued in Duranti & Ochs (1979).

For what concerns bilingual speech, nominal LDs are normally permitted in the same contexts in English and Spanish and do not pose a problem since the dislocand constitutes an equivalence point. Pronominal LDs, on the other hand, seem to be absent in English and mostly related to contrastive values (Rizzi 1997), as indicated in example (35):

(35) That silly season when everybody loves everybody else. **Me** - I'm different! everybody hates me and I hate everybody [Carl Barks, "Christmas on Bear Mountain". In *Four Color Comics* 178 (December 1947), Dell Comics]

In Spanish, however, pronominal LD is normally described as a salient feature of spoken language (Hidalgo 2002; Hidalgo Downing & Hidalgo Downing 2007). In such cases, Hidalgo Downing & Hidalgo Downing (2007) observe that the function of this type of dislocation is pragmatic rather than purely informative: in the case of anaphoric pronouns, it can be said to have a textual function related to anaphoric encapsulation of wider paragraphs, and it is often exploited for topic closure (see also Downing 1997); in the case of personal pronouns, and in particular 1st person pronouns, left dislocation is generally related to interpersonal strategies of stressing and hedging.

One could therefore conclude that, whereas nominal LDs represent a less problematic switching point, since their form and function is equivalent in English and Spanish, this is not the case with personal or anaphoric pronouns are involved. As indicated in the examples below, the same construction is acceptable in Spanish but it would be infelicitous in English in the same context.

(36) *el perro*, are you gonna stay with it or what

a. that dog, are you gonna stay with it or what?

b. *el perro, tu vas a quedarte con él, o qué*?

(37) *yo* I'm very passionate about it

a. ?me, I'm very passionate about it

b. yo, me apasiona mucho eso

To conclude, bilingual left dislocations can thus be partially explained with reference to Poplack's (1980) notion of equivalence. Nominal LDs, being formally and functionally equivalent in both languages, constitute equivalence points where code mixing is favoured; pronominal LDs, on the other hand, seem to be more similar in form and function to the Spanish monolingual construction, regardless of the overt material that is realised. This latter case shows that Spanish is pragmatically dominant in the sense of Matras (1998), in that it provides the underlying pattern related to a specific pragmatic function. Furthermore, in Discourse Grammar terms, pronominal left dislocation appears more clearly related to thetical grammar, and in particular to the function of managing the interaction between speaker and addressee: this seems to be another possible reason why these constructions are so consistent with the behaviour of the other theticals taken into account.

3.2.2 Pseudo-clefts

Similar to left dislocations, pseudo-cleft sentences (or *wh*-clefts) are complex constructions whose function is chiefly to mark Focus in a sentence. They are

part of the family of cleft constructions described in Lambrecht (2001b), and in their prototypical form they are formed by a free standing relative clause introduced by a *wh*-pronoun, whose propositional content is pragmatically presupposed, and a copular sentence, whose subject is the propositional Focus. See examples:

(38) What I need is a little time more

(39) *Lo que necesito es un poquito de tiempo mas*

For a general overview of both the syntactic and the informational properties of pseudo-cleft sentences, the speaker is referred to Collins (1991), Dik (1997) and Lambrecht (2001b). Specific attention is given here to a more specific instance of pseudo-clefts, namely those cases where rather than expressing an informative value of the proposition, which would be regarded as a sentence-grammar function, the construction expresses a function on the discourse level. This means that, even though pseudo-clefts are more integrated into the clause, and are formed according to the principles of sentence grammar, there are also cases in which they may be considered as part of thetical grammar. In many languages, the subject of the copular sentence in a pseudo-cleft can also be an entire proposition, as in (40):

(40) What I want to say is that your idea has many weak points

This type of structure partially differs from the ones quoted above, in that the function of the pseudo-cleft is no longer that of marking sentence Focus, but rather to introduce a new proposition of the sentence-focus type (Lambrecht

1994), whose content is entirely asserted. Now, sentences like (40) may give rise to partially fixed structures, such as the ones described for Spanish in Travis (2005) and Curnow & Travis (2004); in a sentence like (41) the authors argue that the free relative *lo que pasa* is working as a partially non-compositional element which has undergone, or is undergoing, a process of grammaticalisation, and is developing into a textual device:[12]

(41) Lo que pas-a es que, yo ahor-ita no
What happen-3SG is that I now-DIM NEG
estoy trabajando
AUX.DUR work
"what happens is that at present I am not working" [Curnow & Travis 2004]

Now, in Gibraltar's bilingual speech, such specific instances of pseudo-clefts seem to pattern in the same way as other ECCs. Occurrences of bilingual pseudo-clefts can be found where the proposition introduced as the argument of the copula is in English, and the "introductory" *wh*-clause is in Spanish:

(42) *lo que* *pasa* *é* *que* i'm going training
what happen.PRES.3SG is that
'*what happens is that* I'm going training'

(43) *lo que* *pasó* *era* *que* they started the youth as a normal thing
what happen.PST.3SG was that
'*what happened was that* they started the youth [center] as a normal thing'

[12] For a similar account on Italian, see *inter al.* Berretta (2002), Pannunzi (2009).

What is, however, found much more frequently in the same corpus are bilingual sentences containing a connective *é_que* (*es que*), probably arising from grammaticalisation of structures such as the ones quoted above (see Travis (2005: 51) and references given there), and with a similar function of signalling the new and rhematic status of the following proposition; this is shown on the following examples:

(44) *é_que* D *y el hermano* are two different kinds of person

DM D and the brother

'*it is that* D and the brother are two different kind of person'

(45) there's a word ## *é_que* i can't think of it right now

'there's a word, *it's just that* I can't think of it right now'

To conclude, our data seem to suggest that the bilingual patterns highlighted for simple elements like formulaic theticals apply with the same consistency to more complex types of theticals, and in particular to abstract patterns which are not lexically filled, like dislocations. If supported by quantitative evidence, these tendencies could possibly show that such a productive expansion of bilingual patterns from simple structures to more complex ones is one of the ways in which fusion in the sense of Auer (2014) starts to take place.

3.3 Spontaneous theticals

Spontaneous theticals in bilingual speech are more difficult to analyse than left dislocations and pseudo-clefts, since they do not involve lexical elements, neither simple nor complex, but instead typically involve larger and fully compositional constructions, which often have a clausal structure. From the perspective of bilingual speech, this type of switching has to be evaluated in a partially different way:

(46) *pué que tu vea' que* you keep the cultures

DM that 2SG.NOM see.SUBJ.PRES.2SG that

"*well, mind the fact that* you keep the cultures"

In a sentence like (46), the string *que tu vea'que* can easily be recognised as a compositional element with a clear interactional function, aimed at enhancing the cooperation between speaker and hearer by eliciting a greater involvement of the hearer; it could therefore be recognised as a spontaneous thetical. Now, even though the pattern quoted above seems very similar to the one which has been observed for formulaic and constructional theticals, the status of (46) has to be regarded as slightly different. Formulaic and constructional theticals correspond to single-word or single-item switches which do not have a local pragmatic function in Auer's (1999) terms, that is to say that switching of a DM or of a left dislocated element does not contribute additional meaning to the construction. On the contrary, when systematic regularities are found, like in the cases discussed above, switching itself can be said to be globally meaningful. However, this does not seem to be the case

of parenthetical clauses like (46), which represent a totally different phenomenon. Since these constructions do express a local pragmatic function, they seem to be more clearly related to the phenomenon of *intersentential code switching*. While the emergence of patterns involving syntagmatically more simple types of theticals can be defined as a routine and partially unconscious operation of the speakers, the use of theticals created on the spot, through cooptation, seems to rest partially on a different basis. I argue therefore that even though there is a strong common principle to switching of all types of theticals, definable in Maschler's (1994) terms as separation of *languaging* and *metalanguaging*, there seems to be qualitative differences between elements that have undergone grammaticalisation, at least partially, and elements that have not.

4 Conclusion

From what has been shown in Section 3, a number of conclusions can be drawn. First, it has to be stressed that the formation of bilingual patterns is relevant both from a sociolinguistic perspective and from a structural one. A sociolinguistic characterisation of the community was considered to be needed at the beginning of the chapter in order to consider at least some of the social and cultural factors that may have had influence on the bilingual

practices of the community. Conversely, the outcomes of the analysis appear even more relevant from a sociolinguistic perspective: the emergence of regular patterns in bilingual speech was thus interpreted as the first step in the formation of a mixed code which is able to express social meaning in opposition to monolingual practices.

From a structural perspective, on the other hand, our research has provided qualitative evidence of what can constitute a regular pattern in bilingual speech: the most striking fact about code mixing in Gibraltar was the unidirectionality of the switches, rather than obligatoriness: even though high frequency of certain types of switch clearly points to an increase in obligatoriness, what is really predictable and regular is the direction of the switch, since in all bilingual sentences the ECCs were expressed in Spanish while the clause was in English.

Finally, this clear cut distinction, which is iconically made more evident in bilingual speech, can provide new evidence in support of a view of Discourse Grammar in which Sentence Grammar is in many ways separated from Thetical Grammar: it has been shown that bilingual clauses are based on a similar distinction, and different types of theticals show the same regularities in spite of their syntactic complexity. One of the most significant findings, therefore, is the fact that even constructional theticals that do not correspond to simple lexical expressions, such as left dislocations, pattern in the same way and with the same consistency of formulaic expressions.

The main question that arises, and which in my opinion should be investigated in future studies, is the relation between code mixing and different types of theticals. It is known from Heine (2013) that a cline of grammaticalisation can be individuated from spontaneous to constructional to formulaic theticals, but one should ask whether bilingual speech works in the same way. If code mixing and fusion have to be regarded as emergent bilingual grammar, in the terms of Maschler (1994), will regularities start to emerge from intersentential patterns involving spontaneous theticals, or rather from clause-peripheral alternations involving constructional and formulaic theticals? And more importantly, if the two processes, as I argued, are to be seen as unrelated, what are the linguistic or extralinguistic factors favouring each of them in a given contact scenario?

Acknowledgements

I am thankful to many people who contributed with both enthusiasm and criticism to this paper. First of all, I am deeply indebted to my PhD advisor, Massimo Cerruti, for several conversations on these topics. Furthermore, I would like to thank all the people from the OTC conference in Wien for their remarks, and in particular Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer and Bernd Heine. Finally, I am thankful to the two anonymous reviewers for their careful

reading which has been fundamental in the preparation of the final version of this paper.

References

Aijmer, Karin. 2002. *English discourse particles. Evidence from a corpus.* Amsterdam: Benjamins

Algeo, John, 1988. “The tag question in British English. It’s different, i’n’it?”. *English-World-Wide* 9 (2), 171-191.

Algeo, John. 2006. *British or American English. A handbook of word and grammar patterns.* Cambridge: CUP.

Álvarez-Cáccamo, Celso. 1998. “From 'switching code' to 'code switching': Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes”. In: Auer, Peter 1998: ed. *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London / New York, Routledge: 29-48.

Ariel, Mira & Caterina Mauri. 2014. “To include or to exclude: Or, is that the question?” Submitted.

Ariel, Mira. 2010. *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.

Auer, Peter. 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London / New York, Routledge.

Auer, Peter. 1999. “From code switching via language mixing to fused lects. Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech”. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3: 309-332.

Auer, Peter. 2005. “Europe's Sociolinguistic Unity, or: A Typology of European Dialect / Standard Constellations”. In: Nicole Delbecque, Johan van der Auwera & Dirk Geeraerts (eds.), *Perspectives on Variation*, Berlin, De Gruyter: 7-42.

Auer, Peter. 2014. “Language mixing and language fusion: when bilingual talk becomes monolingual”. In: Juliane Besters-Dilger, Cynthis Dermarkar, Stefan Pfänder & Achim Rabus (eds.) *Congruence in Contact-Induced Language Change.* Berlin, De Gruyter: 294-334.

Bakker, Peter & Yaron Matras. 2003. *The Mixed Language Debate. Theoretical and Empirical Advances*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Berk-Seligson, Susan. 1986. “Linguistic constraints on intra-sentential code-switching: A study of Spanish-Hebrew bilingualism”. *Language in Society* 15, 313-48.

Berretta, Monica. 2002. “Quello che voglio dire che: le scisse da strutture topicalizzanti a connettivi testuali”. In: Gian Luigi Beccaria & Carla Marello (eds.) *La parola al testo. Scritti per Bice Mortara Garavelli*, Alessandria, Dell'Orso: 15-31.

Berruto, Gaetano. 1987 “Lingua, dialetto, diglossia, dilalia”". In: Gunther Holtus, & Johannes Kramer (eds.) *Romania et Slavia adriatica. Festschrift für Žarko Muljačić*. Hamburg, Buske Verlag: 57-82.

Brody, Jill. 1987. “Particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan languages”. *Anthropological Linguistics* 29: 507-532.

Butler, Christopher. 2003. *Structure and function. A guide to the three major structural-functional theories.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan & Suzanne Fleischman. 1995. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. “Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view”. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York, Academic Press: 25-55.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A' Dependencies*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Collins, Peter C. 1991. *Cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions in English*. London: Routledge.

Curnow, Timothy Jowan & Catherine E. Travis. 2004. “The emphatic *es* construction of Colombian Spanish”. In Christo Moskovsky (ed), *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*. *http://www.als.asn.au*.

de Rooij, Vincent. 2000. “French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili conversations”. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (4): 447-469

Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernandez Soriano. 2014. “Evidentiality and illocutionary force. Spanish matrix 'que' at the syntax-semantics interface”. In: Andreas Dufter & Álvaro Octavio de Toledo (eds.), *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish. Diachronic, variationist, and typological perspectives*, Amsterdam, Benjamins: 217-252.

Dik, Simon. 1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Vol II: Complex and derived constructions.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Downing, Angela. 1997. “Discourse pragmatic functions of the Theme constituent in Spoken European Spanish”. In: John Connolly (ed.) *Discourse and pragmatics in functional Grammar*, Berlin, De Gruyter: 167-161.

Duranti, Alessandro & Elinor Ochs. 1979. “Left dislocation in Italian conversation”. In: Givón, T. (ed.) *Syntax and semantics. Discourse and Syntax. Vol 12.* New York, Academic Press: 377-416.

Escandell Vidal, Victoria. 1999. “Los enunciados interrogativos. Aspectos semánticos y pragmáticos”. In: Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, Vol 3, cap. 61, Madrid, Real Academia Española (Colección Nebrija y Bello) / Espasa: 3929-3991.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1991. *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Garrido, Joaquín. 1998. "Discourse structure in grammar". In: *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 6: 49-63.

Goria, Eugenio, 2015. *Il discorso bilingue a Gibilterra. L'emergere di schemi regolari nella commutazione di codice*. PhD thesis, Università di Pavia.

Goria, Eugenio. Forthcoming *a*. "Commutazione di codice ai confine della frase. Inglese e spagnolo a Gibilterra". In Raffaella Bombi & Vincenzo Orioles *Atti del XLVIII congresso internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana "Lingue in contatto / Contact Lingusitics"*, Udine 25-27 september 2014.

Goria, Eugenio. Forthcoming *b*. "Functional markers in llanito code-switching. Regular patterns in Gibraltar's bilingual speech". In Chiara Fedriani & Andrea Sansò (eds.) *Pragmatic Markers, Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. What do we know and where do we go from here?* Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Gumperz, John J. 1964. "Hindi-Punjabi Code-Switching in Delhi". In: H. Hunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics*, The Hague: Mouton: 1115-1124.

Heine, Bernd. 2013. “On discourse markers: Grammaticalisation, pragmaticalization or something else?” *Linguistics* 2013; 51(6): 1205-1247.

Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva & Haiping Long 2013. “An outline of discourse grammar”. In: Shannon Bischoff & Carmen Jany (eds.), *Functional Approaches to Language*. Berlin, De Gruyter: 175-233.

Heine, Bernd, Tania Kuteva & Gunther Kaltenböck. 2014. “Discourse Grammar, the dual process model, and brain lateralization: Some correlations”. *Language and Cognition* 6, 1: 146-80.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1989. “Layers and operators in Functional Grammar”. *Linguistics* 25: 127-157.

Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hidalgo Downing, Raquel & Laura Hidalgo Downing. 2007. “Metadiscursive and interpersonal values of pronominal topics in spoken Spanish”. In: Christopher S. Butler, Raquel Hidalgo Downing & Julia Lavid (eds.) *Functional Perspectives on Grammar and Discourse: In honour of Angela Downing*. Amsterdam, Benjamins: 327–348.

Hidalgo, Raquel. 2002. “Establishing topic in conversation: a contrastive study of left-dislocation in English and Spanish”. Angela Downing, Jesus Moya & José I. Albentosa (eds.), *Talk and text. Studies on spoken and griten discourse*, Cuenca, Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha: 31-50.

Holzinger, Daniel. 1993. *Das Rómanes: Grammatik und Diskursanalyse der Sprache der Sinte*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine, & Tania Kuteva. 2011. “On thetical grammar”. *Studies in Language* 35, 4: 848-893.

Kellerman, Anja. 2001. *A New New English. Language, Politics and Identity in Gibraltar*. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Schriften zur Sprache und Kultur.

Kellermann, Anja. 1996. "When Gibraltarians speak we’re quite unique! Constructing Gibraltarian identity with the help of English, Spanish and their respective local varieties". In: S.M. De Oliveira (ed.) The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity. First International Conference on Sociolinguistics in Portugal. Evora: CIDEHUS.UE : 73–8..

Kimps, Ditte, Kristin Davide & Bert Cornille. 2014. “A speech function analysis of tag questions in British English spontaneous dialogue”. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 66: 64-85.

Kuzar, Ron & Hadar Netz. 2010. “Empirical support for the principle of the separation of reference and role”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 1460–1468.

Lambrecht, Knud, 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge, CUP.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2001a. “Dislocation”. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.) *Language Typology and Language Universals: An International Handbook*. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, 20). Vol. 2, Berlin / New York, De Gruyter: 1050-1078.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2001b. “A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions”. *Linguistics* 39 (3): 463-516.

Levey, David. 2008. *Language change and variation in Gibraltar*. Amsterdam, Benjamins

Lipski, John. 1986. “Sobre el bilinguismo Anglo-Hispánico en Gibraltar”. In: *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen,* 3 / LXXXVII.

Martin Zorraquino, Maria Antonia & José Portolés. 1999. “Los marcadores del discurso”. In: Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.). *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe: 4051-4213.

Maschler, Yael. 1994. “Metalanguaging and discourse markers in bilingual conversation”. *Language in Society* 23:3, 325-366.

Maschler, Yael. 1998. “On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code”. In: Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation*. London: Routledge: 125-149

Maschler, Yael. 2000. “Toward fused lects: Discourse markers in Hebrew-English bilingual conversation twelve years later”. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(4): 529-561.

Matras, Yaron. 1997. "The function and typology of coordinating conjunctions: evidence from discourse and language-contact situations." In: John Connolly (ed.) *Discourse and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar*. Berlin, De Gruyter: 177 - 191.

Matras, Yaron. 1998. "Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing". *Linguistics* 36(2): 281 – 331.

Matras, Yaron. 2000. "Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers". *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(4): 505 - 528.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact.* Cambridge: CUP.

Matras, Yaron. 2011. "Universals of structural borrowing". In: Siemund, Peter (ed.) *Linguistic universals and language variation*. Berlin, De Gruyter: 200-229.

Mauri, Caterina. 2009. *Coordination relations in the languages of Europe and beyond.* Berlin, DeGruyter.

Mesthrie Rajend & Rakesh Bhatt. 2008. *World Englishes. The study of new linguistic varieties.* Cambridge: CUP.

Moyer, Melissa. 1998 "Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar". In: Peter Auer (ed.) *Codeswitching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London, Routledge.

Moyer, Melissa. 2000. "Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Spanish-English bilingual conversations with *no*". *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4 (4): 485-504.

Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech*. Cambridge, CUP.

Muysken, Pieter. 2008. *Functional Categories*. Cambridge, CUP.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in code-switching.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Overstreet, Maryann. 1999. *Whales, Candlelight, and Stuff Like That: General Extenders in English Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pannunzi, Alessandro. 2009. "Strutture scisse e pseudoscisse: valori d'uso del verbo 'essere' e articolazione dell'informazione nell'italiano parlato". In: Angela Ferrari (ed.). *Sintassi storica e sincronica dell'italiano.*

Subordinazione, coordinazione, giustapposizione. Firenze, Cesati: pp. 1121-1137.

Pons Bordería, Salvador. 2006. “A functional approach to the study of discourse markers”. In: Kerstin Fischer (ed.) *Approaches to discourse particles.* Amsterdam, Elsevier: 77-100.

Poplack, Shana. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching". *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.

Prince, Ellen. 1981 “Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information”. In: Peter Cole (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics*, New York, Academic Press: 223-254.

Prince, Ellen. 1984. “Topicalization and Left-Dislocation: A Functional Analysis”. In: *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* (433): 213–225.

Rivero, María Luisa. 1980. “On left-dislocation and topicalization in Spanish”. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(2): 363-393.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. “The fine structure of the left periphery”. In Liliane Hageman (ed.) *Elements of grammar.* Kluwer, Dordrecht: 281-337.

Salmons, Joseph. 1990. “Bilingual discourse marking: Codeswitching, borrowing, and convergence in some German-American dialects”. *Linguistics* 28: 453–480.

Stolz, Christel & Thomas Stolz. 1996. “Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika. Spanisch Amerindischer Sprachkontakt Hispanoindiana II. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49: 86-123.

Stolz, Thomas. 2007. “*Allora.* On the recurrence of function-word borrowing in contact situations with Italian as a donor language”. In Jochen Rehbein, Christiane Hohenstein & Lukas Pietsch (eds.) *Connectivity in grammar and discourse,* Amsterdam, Benjamins: 75-99.

Thomason, Sarah. 2001. *Language Contact. An introduction.* Edinburgh, University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 2007. “Discussion article: Discourse markers, modal particles, and contrastive analysis, synchronic and diachronic”. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6: 139-157.

Travis, Catherine. 2005. *Discourse markers in Colombian Spanish: A study in polysemy*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. 1994. *Mixing two languages. French-Dutch contact in a comparative perspective.* Berlin: De Gruyter.